

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. The Examiner has maintained the rejection of original claims 1-21 and has rejected previously added claims 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,313,587 (MacLennan, *et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,066,799 (Nugent). Applicants have canceled claims 1-8, 11-14, 19-22, and 25-26, and have amended claims 9-10, 15, and 23. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant respectfully traverses the section 103 rejections.

Applicant has amended independent claim 9 to more clearly distinguish it from the references cited by the Examiner. As amended, claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, a plurality of lamps that generate light, an image display unit that receives the light to display an image using liquid crystal, a light guide plate that guides the light to the image display unit, and a plurality of power supply lines which electrically connect a power source to the lamps.

None of the added elements are present in either MacLennan or Nugent.

MacLennan is directed to a lamp and an oscillator circuit. Although the passages cited by the Examiner (col. 45, ll. 9-30, col. 102, ll. 24-34, and col. 103, l. 61 to col 104, l. 10) disclose a single lamp head enclosure, a base for the lamp head enclosure, and a power supply, there is no disclosure of a plurality of lamps, an image display unit using liquid crystal, a light guide plate, or a plurality of power supply lines. In addition, the power supply is not mounted in the receiving member, as claimed in Applicant's claim 9. Although MacLennan's Fig. 15 does depict a lamp used in connection with a generic projection display, there is otherwise no disclosure of those elements needed for integrating MacLennan's lamp into a liquid crystal display device, such as the liquid crystal image

display unit and the light guide plate, and which are claimed in Applicant's claim 9. MacLennan's disclosure is directed to a single lamp, not one of a plurality of lamps that are part of an apparatus for displaying images.

With reference to the Examiner's statement that MacLennan discloses at least two first power supply lines for supplying a high voltage to the lamps and at least two second power supply lines for supplying a low potential voltage to the lamps, Applicant urges that the cited passages, in particular col. 37, ll. 44-62 and col. 38, ll. 26-33, disclose only a single power source (connector 141) into a series resonant circuit that includes a first capacitor that provides a high voltage and a second capacitor that provides a low voltage. Thus MacLennan does not disclose the plurality of the power supply lines including at least two first power supply lines that supplies a high voltage to the lamps and at least two second power supply lines that supplies a low voltage to the lamps, as recited in claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully urges that claim 9 is not rendered obvious in view of MacLennan.

In addition, the Examiner points to conformal coating discussed in McLennan, col. 102, ll. 24-33, as disclosing Applicant's first leakage reduction member wrapped around the first power supply lines. However, Applicant urges that MacLennan's conformal coating, which is used to coat a disk capacitor that is part of the series resonant circuit, is distinguishable from a leakage reduction member wrapped around the power supply lines.

Nugent is directed to insulated audio cables that transmit an audio signal. The Examiner cited Nugent as disclosing a leakage reduction member mounted on a power supply line for reducing power leakage. However, even if one can properly combine Nugent

with McLennan, Nugent does not disclose the elements of Applicant's amended claim 9 that are also absent from McLennan.

Thus, the combination of MacLennan and Nugent does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Applicant's amended claim 9. Therefore, Applicant urges that Applicant's amended claim 9 is not *prima facie* obvious in view of MacLennan and Nugent. Reconsideration and withdraw of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 15-18, and 23-24 depend from amended claim 9, and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 9, in addition to being patentable in their own right. Reconsideration and withdraw of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant urges that claims 9, 10, 15-18, and 23-24, as amended, are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated. Early and favorable action on this case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



David L. Heath
Reg. No. 46,763

Mailing Address:

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
1900 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 501
East Meadow, NY 11554
(516) 357-0091
(516) 357-0092 (FAX)